INYO COUNTY FREE LIBRARY

SIERRA NEVADA ALLIANCE FOR PEACE

Inyo and Mono Counties, California P.O. Box 132, Bishop, CA 93514

NEWSLETTER *"War begins in the minds of human beings. Since this is so, the minds of human beings, must also be capable of ending war."* – Preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO August 1988

Volume 2, Number 8 Editor: Mark Bagley

Building Down the East-West Confrontation in Europe

The following is excerpted from "Nucleus", the quarterly newsletter of the Union of Concerned Scientists, Summer 1988, Vol. 10, No.2 --

The major foreign policy and defense task for the new American president will be to consolidate and continue the present trend toward build-down of the East-West political and military confrontation. In Europe, he will have to invigorate a timid and defensive NATO position in order to fully exploit the possibilities of obtaining Soviet agreements to reductions in conventional forces that will be much larger for the Warsaw pact than for NATO.

As a prelude for such reductions, the INF Treaty has brought the first negotiated step toward a build-down of the enormous NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation in Europe. This standoff costs the two alliances together at least $600 billion a year, two-thirds of the worlds's entire annual expenditures for armed forces. It cost the US at least half of its defense budget.

But the enormous costs and risks of the confrontation in Europe are not the only reason to reduce the confrontation. We should move to reduce it for the equally compelling reason that it is obsolete.

A look at the evolution of the Cold War may help to explain why the confrontation is obsolete. We are so used to the Cold War that some of us have forgotten its origins. But many will recall that the dispute with the Soviet Union over how to govern conquered Germany led to the division of that country and was the main cause of the Cold War in Europe. It was the ultimate cause not only of the continuing military confrontation in Europe but also of the US-Soviet strategic nuclear confrontation and of the worldwide competition in conventional forces.

What is less widely realized is that 15 years ago, in the 1970's, the Cold War in Europe peaked politically and started on the downgrade. At that time the Federal Republic of Germany concluded treaties with the USSR and Poland, accepting the post war incorporation of large former German territories into Poland and the USSR, subject to change only by peaceful means. The Federal Republic also accepted East Germany as a separate state, and a remarkable complex of relations has grown between them. The United States, France, and the United Kingdom endorsed this outcome; all NATO states did so once again by signing the 1975 Helsinki Accords.

Whether or not we approve, we should recognize that there has been a big change of direction in the Western acceptance of the territorial status quo in Eastern Europe and the division of Germany. Thirty years ago, the NATO alliance refused to negotiate on East-West arms control until after the Soviets had agreed to unify Germany. On the other side of the equation, in the 1971 Berlin agreement the Soviet Union abandoned its 20-year effort to push the Western allies out of Berlin, an effort that at least twice brought us to the verge of war.

There have been other political changes of direct relevance to the East-West confrontation in Europe. . .

In the political sense neither side is any longer a threat to the other in Europe, and this fact has become clear. The political Cold War, the source of the whole confrontation, is over in Europe. With the political confrontation in decline, the military confrontation no longer makes great sense. Why are both sides spending $600 billion a year for this confrontation? Neither can afford it. . .

Build Down, Not Up

We should try to dismantle the confrontation cautiously but deliberately. The best way to resolve the issue of defense cost- and burden- sharing with our allies is to build down, not up. The INF Treaty contains valuable precedents for conventional reductions and far-reaching verification measures. Moreover, NATO and Warsaw Pact negotiators are near agreement on a framework for new NATO-Pact reduction in the area from the United Kingdom to the Ural Mountains in the USSR, and the talks could start this fall.

. . . The numerous Soviet concessions to the Western position on INF, strategic nuclear weapons, and chemical weapons give weight to the statement of willingness to make larger Pact than NATO reductions. The Soviet Union could make good use of money saved on conventional forces. So could we.

Barriers to Agreement

After 40 years of East-West military confrontation in Europe and after 15 fruitless years of negotiations in the Vienna Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) Talks, it looks at last as thought there is a real opening for a negotiated build-down. But appearances can be deceiving. NATO has not recovered from the shock of INF success. It is so divided over the issue of further reduction of nuclear weapons that its decision-making capacity is seized up like an overheated engine.

continued on second page . . .

Announcing the Second Annual

☞ **SNAP Labor Day Picnic**

Monday, Sept. 5, at 3:00 pm

Millpond Park, Bishop (details on page 3)

Building Down in Europe *(story from first page)*

. . .What is worrisome about these signs of disarray on both sides is the effect they can have in delaying results from the new negotiations. And time is a problem. If the new talks go on four or five years without an outcome and appear to be a repetition of the sterile MBFR Talks, powerful trends will emerge in American political opinion for unilateral reduction of American forces in Europe, and in European public opinion for unilateral reduction or restructuring of European NATO forces.

Exploiting the Opening

Our next president should treat the new Atlantic-to-the-Urals talks on conventional forces in Europe as an opportunity and energetically and purposefully move to exploit the opening. Here are some specific ways the next president could activate the NATO posture and move toward a more productive position:

- Instead of aiming for tank and artillery parity in the Atlantic-to-the-Urals area in one bite, we should aim for it first in a Central European zone like that proposed by the Poles.

- Instead of lumping together the armaments of active-duty and reserve Pact unit as NATO does, we should focus reductions on active-duty Soviet units with the most modern tanks in the forward position in Eastern Europe.

- Instead of refusing to reduce NATO fighter-bombers, we should be willing to reduce them by up to 25 percent to parity with the Warsaw Pact as part of a package deal including reduction of tank, artillery, and armed helicopters by 10 to 25 percent of present NATO holdings. This would be accompanied by sufficient Warsaw Pact reductions of the same armaments to achieve parity for both alliances in the Central European area.

- Instead of refusing to negotiate on reduction of tactical nuclear missiles, as part of an overall package we should agree to a low level of 200-300 for each alliance to cover both nuclear and conventionally armed missiles of ranges below 500 km, with freedom to modernize. This could contribute not only to asymmetrical Soviet reductions of armored forces but could also reduce a large Soviet superiority in tactical missiles.

Nonreduction Constraint Proposals

Reductions in these new talks are going to be more complicated than MBFR or even than strategic nuclear reductions. For example, in INF it proved impractical to have agreed ceilings only on those Soviet missiles west of the Urals, and we finally had to agree on a worldwide zero to cover Soviet forces in Asia. There will be similar pressures in the new talks.

Therefore, the West should put forward a package of nonreduction constraint proposals for agreed restrictions on military activities and deployment to include: 1) a restricted military area or zone of disengagement in Central Europe, and 2) pulling back major ammunition depots a fixed distance from the dividing line and placing them in secured storage, inspected by the opposing alliance. The same approach could be used for specialized equipment like pipe-laying equipment, tank transporters, mine-clearing equipment, and tanks equipped with bridging.

Up to now, NATO has shown little enthusiasm for such proposals, although it is quite possible-and perhaps necessary-that agreement can be reached on measures like these before agreement on reductions.

Most important of all, the United States and other members of NATO must come together in a common concept of what they want to achieve in these new talks with the Soviet Union. Our ultimate goal of deep cuts– reductions of as much as 50 percent of NATO holdings of major weapons and ground and air force manpower by the year 2000, with a 50 percent savings on NATO's current budget of about $150 billion–might be achievable.

–– By Jonathan Dean, former US ambassador to the conventional-force reduction talks in Vienna, is arms control advisor to the Union of Concerned Scientists, 26 Church Street, Cambridge, MA 02238.

The Arms Race and The California Senate Race

In the following 8 Senate roll call votes California Senator Pete Wilson cast a deciding vote in favor of increased military spending. Each of these issues was determined by a single vote. And in each instance Wilson's Democratic challenger, Leo McCarthy, would have changed the outcome by voting differently had he been in the U.S. Senate.

1) NERVE GAS 7/13/83 — Vote 50-49
   Senate refuses to stop production of nerve gas.
   Pete Wilson votes to continue production.

2) NERVE GAS 11/8/83 — Vote 47-46
   Senate votes $124.4 million for production of nerve gas.
   Senator Wilson votes in favor of nerve gas production.

3) MX MISSILE 7/14/84 — Vote 49-48
   Senate refuses to kill funding for MX Missile.
   Pete Wilson votes to fund the missile.

4) STAR WARS 8/5/86 — Vote 50-49
   Senate kills amendment to reduce Star Wars funding.
   Senator Wilson votes to increase spending.

5) STAR WARS 8/5/86 — Vote 50-49
   Senate rejects amendment to slow funding for Star Wars.
   Senator Pete Wilson votes to increase Star War funding.

6) BIG EYE CHEMICAL BOMB 8/7/86 — Vote 50-50
   Senate refuses to kill $57 million for chemical bombs.
   Senator Wilson votes in favor of the chemical weapon.

7) STAR WARS 9/22/87 — Vote 50-50
   Senate kills spending curb on Star Wars.
   Pete Wilson votes for a substantial increase in funding.

8) BIG EYE CHEMICAL BOMB 9/24/87 — Vote 49-48
   Senate again stops move to reduce funds for this bomb.
   Senator Wilson votes for the chemical bomb.

These votes are an example of the clear differences between the candidates in the upcoming Senate election. Pete Wilson has been a strong supporter of the Reagan military buildup and oft times weilds a critical vote on defense issues. Leo McCarthy can make a difference in turning around the arms race if he is elected.

August Meeting - Hiroshima Day

The August SNAP meeting was held on August 6th, the anniversary of the Atomic blast at Hiroshima. Over a dozen SNAP members commemorated Hiroshima Day by gathering in the Bishop City Park to fold paper cranes and share a pot luck dinner. As cranes were folded they were strung up to catch the breeze and evening light alongside the SNAP banner. These cranes have been sent to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Center in Japan. Everyone present signed a letter which was included describing SNAP and our hopes that peace will prevail through the efforts of many. Petitions from Hiroshima and Nagasaki appealing for a ban on nuclear weapons, informational posters, and a newsletter sign-up were available.

National Nuclear Waste Transportation Task Force Meeting, Sept. 9-11

Citizen Alert, a group based in Reno and Las Vegas is sponsoring a meeting dealing with the issue of high-level nuclear waste transportation. The meeting is scheduled for Sept. 9-11, in Washoe Valley near Reno. Currently, Yucca Mountain (on the Nevada Test Site) has been selected as the likely spot for a national high-level nuclear waste disposal and storage site. Wastes would be transported to the site by trucks and trains from all over the nation. Representatives of organizations from a dozen states will be attending.

For a copy of the meeting agenda call Mark Bagley at 873-5326 or for more information contact the Citizen Alert Reno Office at 702-827-4200, Box 5391, Reno, NV 89513.

☞ Next SNAP Meeting

Monday, Sept. 5th, 3:00 pm

Second Annual SNAP Labor Day Picnic

Millpond Park Gazebo, Bishop

Join us on Labor Day when we declare Millpond Park a Nuclear Free Zone for a day! "Disarmament Races" begin at 3:00 pm, followed by a potluck picnic.

Bring something to grill, a pot luck dish to share, and your own drinks, plates and silverware. SNAP will provide the charcoal and ice. Bring your children, relatives, and friends — everyone is welcome!

From the Editor

Thank you to this month's contributors and the folks who helped to get this out: Larry Freilich, Kerry Jellison, Irene Yamashita, Robert Atlee, and Jeff Cook.

Help Support SNAP!

FALL COLORS PEACE FLIGHT

Saturday & Sunday, October 22-23, 1988, Bishop

One of the SNAP activities that received a lot of support at our Jan. meeting was the idea of holding a balloon rally. It would be colorful, exciting, fun, and possibly attract a large number of people. We could raise funds and educate people. As announced in our last newsletter, SNAP and High Sierra Ballooning will co-sponsor such a rally this fall in Bishop. Robert Atlee, ballonist and owner of High Sierra Ballooning, has agreed to make the necessary arrangements with other ballonists and will act as overall coordinator for the event. Robert will be at the SNAP Labor Day Picnic where we can talk about ideas for the rally.

We need your help to make this an exciting success. With your ideas and energy there are many things we could do during the rally. The basic outline for the event is to have at least 3 hot air balloons and up to 10 or more depending on our local support. There would be sunrise flights over Bishop on Sat. and Sun., and an evening lift off on Sat. Rides for the public would be offered. We'll get together to make peace banners to fly from the balloons. A Sat. evening potluck barbeque and country dance is planned as are Sat. and Sun. morning breakfasts for the rally participants. If you can help, even if for only a few hours, please indicate on the coupon below and mail it to Robert Atlee, 201 S. Warren St., Bishop, CA 93514, or call 873-5838 and leave a message.

FALL COLORS PEACE FLIGHT — I would like to help with the following:

in prepration of the event

- ☐ Banner making
- ☐ Local promotion and publicity
- ☐ Mailings
- ☐ Whatever is needed

on Oct. 22-23

- ☐ Provide food for potluck or breakfasts (extra needed for pilots)
- ☐ Housing for pilots and their families
- ☐ Help with rally itself
- ☐ SNAP information table

Other ideas:

LEGISLATIVE REPORT AND ACTION ALERTS

Fiscal Year 1989 Defense Authorization Bill

In an unexpected move, President Reagan has vetoed the 1989 Defense Authorization Bill. He objected to most of the arms control provisions and budget cuts, although they enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress. Specifically, the bill would have:

- Cut Reagan's $5 billion request for the Star Wars program down to $4 billion and effectively killed early deployment of the Space Based Interceptor by cutting funding back to $85 million.
- Cut Reagan's request for the MX rail garrison basing mode from $837 million to $250 million.
- Established a moratorium on depressed trajectory missile flight testing.
- Established a nuclear test ban readiness program and provided $37.6 million in funding for seismic verification research.
- Required the early retirement of 2 Poseiden nuclear missile submarines to bring the U.S. closer to the sublimits of offensive nuclear forces as called for in the SALT II Treaty.
- Barred Star Wars tests that would violate the traditional interpretation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

In early August the Senate took action to draft a defense appropriations bill which was essentially similar to their original authorization bill (before it went to the House-Senate Conference Committee). This bill had higher spending limits and fewer arms control provisions than the final bill the President vetoed. The House will also have to draft a new bill and go to the Conference Committee. It is expected the House will push for the same arms control provisions which were in its original bill.

There is no chance that Congress will override the President's veto. The Congressional recess ends Sept. 6 and quick action will probably be taken because Fiscal 1989 begins on Oct. 1. If the President again vetoes a new defense bill, Congress will draft a continuing resolution to fund the military, providing another opportunity to include arms control measures.

ACTION: Rep. Bill Thomas (Inyo) and Senator Pete Wilson have opposed the arms control provisions and the lower spending levels contained in the vetoed bill. Rep. Richard Lehman (Mono) and Senator Cranston supported the bill. Write or call Thomas and Wilson to urge their support for arms control measures during the upcoming Defense budgeting process. Urge Lehman and Cranston to continue their support in the face of the President's opposition.

Where to Write or Call

Senator _____
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Hon. Bill Thomas (Inyo) -or-
Hon. Richard Lehman (Mono)
House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Follow your letter with a telephone call, or just call, via the Capitol Hill switchboard at 202-224-3121. If you have specific questions, you can call the Nuclear Arms Control Hotline (Eastern Standard Time) at 202-543-4100, or for a recorded message, call 202-543-0006.

Sierra Nevada Alliance for Peace
P.O. Box 132
Bishop, CA 93514

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Bishop, CA
Permit # 49

FORWARDING AND ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

INYO COUNTY LIBRARY
168 N. EDWARDS
INDEPENDENCE, CA 93526